



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/684,287	10/06/2000	Steven A. Brosey	80113-0103	1440

7590 04/14/2004

Ronald P. Kananen, Esq.
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER
The Lion Building
1233 20th Street, N. W., Suite 501
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER

BUI, KIEU OANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/684,287

Applicant(s)

BROSEY, STEVEN A.

Examiner

KIEU-OANH T BUI

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7&8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-13, and 17-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Blatter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,754,651/ or "Blatter" hereinafter).

Regarding claim 1, Blatter discloses "an apparatus for extracting messages from a digital data stream containing messages", i.e., an apparatus as shown in Fig. 1 for extracting messages from a digital data stream MPEG (col. 1/lines 18-47 for MPEG; and col. 2/lines 49-60 for extracting messages from the stream), comprising: "a message processor that receives the digital data stream and extracts message portions from the digital data stream", i.e., a decoder 55 receives and extracts message portions from the digital stream to buffers (col. 6/lines 23-42); "a first buffer having a plurality of locations associated with a plurality of channels to store the extracted message portions; and a second buffer having a plurality of locations associated with the plurality of channels for storing state data corresponding to the extracted message portions", i.e., buffer 60 has more than 2 buffers for storing the program or extract message portions and including the PSI information regarding as "state data" for information corresponding to the extracted message portions (col. 6/lines 23-42 & col. 2/lines 25-60 for PSI information addressed).

As for claim 2, in further view of claim 1 above, Blatter further discloses “comprising a central processing unit interface for coupling the apparatus to a central processing unit”, i.e., a buffer control interface 65 acts as an interface for the apparatus coupled to system controller 115 (Fig. 1 and col. 4/lines 23-43).

Regarding claim 3, Blatter discloses “a device for extracting messages from a data stream”, i.e., an apparatus as shown in Fig. 1 for extracting messages from a digital data stream MPEG (col. 1/lines 18-47 for MPEG; and col. 2/lines 49-60 for extracting messages from the stream) comprising: “an input interface that receives packet data in the data stream”, i.e., a decoder 30 acts as an input interface for receiving packet data in the data stream (Fig. 1, and col. 3/lines 38-60); “a packet identifier filter coupled to the input interface to selectively filter the packet data” (Fig. 1/unit 45 for a PID filter, and col. 4/lines 44-65), “the packet identifier filter having a central processing unit (CPU) interface to allow communication between the device and a CPU”, i.e., a buffer control interface 65 acts as a CPU interface for allowing communication between the device and the system controller 115 (Fig. 1); “a message processor that receives the selectively filtered packet data from the packet identifier filter and extracts message portions from the packet data”, i.e., a decoder 55 receives and extracts message portions from the digital stream to buffers (col. 6/lines 23-42); “a first buffer having a plurality of locations associated with a plurality of channels to store the extracted message portions; and a second buffer having a plurality of locations associated with the plurality of channels for storing state data corresponding to the extracted message portions”, i.e., buffer 60 has more than 2 buffers for storing the program or extract message portions and including the PSI information regarding as

“state data” for information corresponding to the extracted message portions (col. 6/lines 23-42 & col. 2/lines 25-60 for PSI information addressed).

As for claim 4, in further view of claim 3, Blatter further shows “wherein the input interface converts the packet data into parallel packet data”, i.e., the CPSI stream can be separated and stored in two parallel helical and non-helical tracks as parallel packet data (col. 14/lines 3-36).

As for claim 5, in further view of claim 4, Blatter further discloses “wherein the parallel packet data is sent to the packet identifier filter with a enable signal to validate byte data in the packet”, i.e., the PIDs of the programs are provided to packet identifier filter to enable the validation or identifying packets for selected programs (col. 7/lines 38-50).

As for claim 6, in further view of claim 5, Blatter further discloses “wherein the input interface generates at least one clock enable signal to resynchronize the byte data” (col. 5/line 57 to col. 6/line 22 for a program clock reference for synchronizing and decoding of content packets after the input interface receives the content packets).

As for claim 7, in further view of claim 3, Blatter further suggests “wherein the packet identifier filter provides at least one selected from the group consisting of mode control, filtering control, enable control and masking control for each channel in the message processor” (Fig. 2 shows a process to generate CPSI from PSI and to incorporate the CPSI in a packetized datastream suitable for storage on a selectable storage medium is an example for the packet identifier filter provides at least one selected from the group consisting of mode control, filtering control, enable control and masking control for each channel in the message processor, see col. 6/line 23 to col. 8/line 3).

As for claim 8, in further view of claim 7 above, Blatter further shows “wherein the mode control includes selecting one of a plurality of storage modes, each storage mode corresponding to a buffer size for the first buffer”, i.e., based upon a destination flag, the control unit determines which one is for which appropriate buffer size according to video, data or audio (col. 5/lines 35-56 & col. 6/lines 23-60).

As for claim 9, in further view of claim 7 above, Blatter further mentions “wherein the mode control includes selecting one of a capture mode, where the packet data is stored in the first buffer as a full packet without a sync byte, and a message mode, where messages in the packet data are allowed to be processed” (col. 7/lines 28-37 & col.7/line 50 to col. 8/line 3 for full program specific information (PSI) being captured and data in the packet data are processed whether in an encryption form or not to appropriate storage).

As for claim 10, in further view of claim 7 above, Blatter further mentions “wherein the filtering control includes selecting whether address filtering is turned on or off, and wherein all messages in the packet data are processed when the address filtering is turned on and selected messages in the packet data are processed when the address filtering is turned off”, i.e., all the message data is filtering”, i.e., whether there is a need for an NRSS decryption, a switch at 35 provides as an on/off switch for the unit 45 decode PID selection as a PID filter also by matching with pre-stored PID selection in unit 47 during the message address filtering process (Fig. 1, and col. 4/line 23 to col. 5/line 22).

As for claim 11, in further view of claim 3 and 10 above, Blatter inherently discloses “wherein the filter module has a pipeline delay to allow the packet identifier of an incoming packet to be compared with at least one predetermined packet identifier”, i.e., a pre-stored PID is

compared and matched during the filtering process above, suggesting to include a pipeline delay (Fig. 1, and col. 4/line 23 to col. 5/line 22).

As for claim 12, in further view of claim 3 above, Blatter further discloses “wherein the filter module validates the incoming packet by checking a header in the incoming packet with at least one predetermined condition” (col. 4/lines 44-58 as header information is checked whether at least one predetermined condition as encryption or not is addressed).

As for claim 13, in further view of claim 3, Blatter shows “wherein the message processor conducts a first process to find a start of a new message in the packet data and a second process to extract and store the message”, i.e., a header of the new message is detected and then being extracted and stored the message in later steps (col. 4/lines 22-58, and col. 5/lines 35-56).

As for claim 17, in further view of claim 3, Blatter shows “wherein the message processor includes: a processor state machine shared between the plurality of channels, wherein the state data from the processor state machine is stored in the second buffer; an address filter control circuit; and a verification circuit that calculates a verification code and compares the calculated verification code with an embedded verification code in the message portion in the packet data”, i.e., PSI data as state data and being stored in a different buffer (col. 4/lines 22-58 & col. 6/lines 23-42); a PID filter and a verification circuit in comparing the PID with the pre-stored PID in the message are addressed earlier claims above.

As for claim 18, in further view of claim 17, Blatter suggests “wherein the message processor further includes an alternative packet capture control that stops message processing for a single channel and captures a single packet for storage in the first buffer” (col. 7/lines 25-37 for the capture of PSI packets during the PSI interruption).

As for claim 19, in further view of claim 17, Blatter further shows “further comprising a buffer control that controls CPU operation while the at least one of the first and second buffers is being read” (Fig. 1 for unit 65 for a buffer control, and col. 5/lines 35-56).

As for claim 20, in further view of claim 19, Blatter further shows “comprising a message ready interrupt control coupled to the buffer control, wherein the message ready interrupt control generates signals for determining which channels have messages that are ready for processing when the CPU is interrupted based on state data in the second buffer”, i.e., a PSI generator system controller 115 provides PSI interruption to the buffer control and generates control signals for determining which channels have messages for processing (col. 6/lines 9-60).

As for claims 21-23, these claims comprising “a message error interface for identifying the presence of lost messages”; “wherein the message error interface includes a first error circuit that identifies messages lost due to corrupt packets and a second error circuit that identifies messages lost due to first buffer overflow”; and “wherein the first and second error circuits are provided for each one of said plurality of channels” are met (col. 14/lines 3-16 as known error encoding, and col. 10/line 52 to col. 11/line 22 for error detection technique including overflow and col. 15/line 49 to col. 16/line 5 for discontinuity or mismatch between packets of a PID and transport error indications addressed).

Regarding claims 24-35, these claims for “a method for extracting messages from a data stream, comprising: receiving packet data in the data stream; selectively filtering the packet data; extracting at least a portion of a message from the packet data; storing said at least a portion of the message in a first buffer associated with said message processor; and storing state data corresponding with said at least a portion of the message in a second buffer” are rejected for the reasons given in the scope of claims 1-13 and 17-23 as discussed in details above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blatter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,754,651).

Regarding claims 14-16, in further view of claim 3, Blatter does not show “wherein the first buffers are circular buffers”; “wherein the first buffer includes 32 available channels each with a 2K buffer for message storage” and “wherein the first buffer includes 16 channels with a 2K buffer and 4 channels with an 8K buffer for message storage”; however, the Examiner takes an Official Notice that it is simply a design choice of the system whether to allocate any buffer type or buffer size for message storage depending on the size of the system and the need for storage. It really does not construct any novelty in whether some one uses this type of buffer or another with this much capacity for a number of channels with a 2K or 8K or 100K for message storage.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Blatter's system with some detailed of the buffer type and the buffer size in order to simply specify the allocation of buffers for message storage within the system.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Blatter et al. (US. Pat. No.5,844,595) disclose a decoding of digital data including program specific information.

Blatter et al. (US. Pat. No.5,838,873) disclose packetized data formats for digital data storage media.

Hamery et al. (US Pat. No.6,650,710 B1) disclose a packet filtering.

Komi et al. (US. Pat. No.6,477,185 B1) disclose a demultiplexing and decoding apparatus for coded audio and video data.

Fries (US Pat. No.6,317,885 B1) discloses an interactive entertainment and information system using television set-top-box.

Loukianov (US Pat. No.6,249,526 B1) discloses a verdatile time division multiple access slot assignment unit.

Wakeland (US Pat. No.6,101,192) discloses a network router with partitioned memory for optimized data storage and retrieval.

Berg et al. (US Pat. No.6,680,952 B1) disclose a method and apparatus for backhaul of telecommunications signaling protocols over packet switching networks.

6. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 77, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krista Kieu-Oanh Bui whose telephone number is (703) 305-0095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 AM to 6:30 PM, with alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile, can be reached on (703) 305-4380.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Krista Bui
Art Unit 2611
April 8, 2004



**KRISTA BUI
PATENT EXAMINER**